

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4 and 6 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4 and 6 are amended. No new matter is added by these amendments. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8 are canceled without disclaimer of or prejudice to subject matter of those claims. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Smith and Wu in the November 29, 2007 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Requirement for Information

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Smith during a brief telephone conference on January 18, 2008. During the telephone conference, the Examiner agreed that submission of English translations of Japanese Office Actions in related Japanese Application Nos. 2002-272567 and 2002-272523, together with a corrected Information Disclosure Statement, will satisfy the requirement for information in the pending Office Action. These documents are included for the Examiner's review. The references associated with Japanese Office Action 2002-272523, as identified on page 1, will be submitted in due course. Therefore, the requirement for information is satisfied.

II. Substantive Rejections of the Pending Claims

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 4-6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,167,191 to Hull et al. (hereinafter "Hull"). Additionally, the Office Action rejects claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,249,281 to Chen et al. (hereinafter "Chen"), in view of U.S. Patent

No. 6,834,371 to Jensen et al. (hereinafter "Jensen"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Office Action asserts that Hull, Chen and Jensen, either alone or in combination, teach the features as positively recited in the pending claims. However, the above references cannot reasonably be considered to teach the features as positively recited in claims 1, 4 and 6, as amended. Specifically, the references fail to teach or suggest varying the size of the displayed relevant static image data based on at least one of importance of the static image data and information added to the static image data, as discussed below.

First, Hull fails to teach or suggest varying the size of the displayed relevant static image data, importance of the static image data, and information added to the static image data. Specifically, Hull teaches parsing a video stream and storing key frames of that video stream in order to differentiate between sections of a video information, as discussed in col. 9, lines 21-34; col. 9, lines 54-67; and col. 10, lines 23-36. Here, Hull simply teaches extracting key frames from a video stream, without categorizing the relative importance of each of the key frames extracted from the video stream. Additionally, because all key frames are of the same size, Hull cannot teach varying the size of the displayed relevant static image data based on information added to the static image data. Therefore, Hull does not teach, nor would it have suggested, the features as discussed above.

Similarly, Jensen also fails to teach or suggest the features as discussed above. Jensen teaches adding multimedia information to slide show presentations, as discussed at least in col. 2, lines 14-22. Specifically, Jensen also fails to teach varying the size of the displayed relevant static image data based on at least the importance of the static image data and information added to the static image data. Further, Jensen fails to teach or suggest importance of the static image data as positively recited in the pending claims. Therefore, Jensen cannot reasonably be considered to teach or suggest the features as discussed above.

Second, Chen fails to teach or suggest varying the size of the displayed relevant static image data based on at least one of importance of the static image data and information added to the static image data, as positively recited in the pending claims. Chen teaches a slide show presentation system, as shown in Fig. 6, where a plurality of slides in a slide show presentation are provided in a preview window, while a current or active slide is provided in a primary window. Additionally, as shown in element 610 of Fig. 6, a secondary slide may also be displayed concurrently with a primary slide during a presentation. However, the slide shown in the primary window is affected only by the sequence number of that slide in the presentation, and whether that slide is the active slide in the presentation. In other words, Chen does not teach or suggest an importance of the static image data outside, but teaches only its position in a sequence of a plurality of slides. Consequently, Chen also cannot reasonably be considered to teach or suggest adding information to the static image data in relation to the varying size of the displayed relevant static image data.

In contrast, as shown at least in Figs. 2A, 2B and 6, and discussed on pages 6 and 10, a retrieval result display unit that displays the retrieved relevant static image data, varying the size of the displayed relevant static image data based on at least one of importance of the static image data and information added to the static image data, is provided. The static image data may be ranked, for example, according to the magnitude of changes in scene contents, the author's intention, or the importance of scenes.

For at least the above reasons, none of Hull, Chen or Jensen, either alone or in combination, can reasonably be considered to teach or suggest combination of features as positively recited in pending independent claims 1, 4 and 6.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 4 and 6 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kirk D. Berkhimer
Registration No. 59,874

JAO:ARK/wkb

Attachments:

English Translations of JP Office Actions

Date: January 25, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--

Notice of Reasons for Rejection

Cited reference/Reference example

Docket Number FE02-01383

Transmittal Number 371257

Mailing Date July 31, 2007



NOTICE OF REASONS FOR REJECTION

Patent Application Number

2002-272567

Date of Action

July 23, 2007

Examiner

Tatsunori TAKENAKA

9197 5C00

Patent Agent

Tatsuo MORIYAMA

Applied Article

Section 29 Article 2

This application is rejected due to the following reasons. If you have any response, please submit your response within 60 days after the mailing date of this notification.

Reasons

The invention related to the following claims of this application would have been easily attainable by one of ordinary skill in the art prior to filing of the application based on the invention(s) described in the following publications in Japan or foreign countries, or publicly accessible via an electric communication line, prior to the filing of the application. Therefore, due to Patent Law Section 29 Article 2, a patent is not obtainable.

Note (See a list of cited references, etc. such as cited references, etc.)

[Claims 1, 4, 6]

Cited reference 1

Note

An image search system that searches still image data correlated to video data, comprising:

input means that receives a keyword input;
extraction means that extracts a character string included in still image data; and
search means that searches subject still image data by referring to the extracted character string and the input keyword. This would have been easily attainable by one of ordinary skill in the art. Sections [0047] - [0058] of cited reference 1 disclose input means, extraction means, and search means.

Therefore, according to cited reference 1, the above-mentioned structure would have been attainable by one of ordinary skill in the art.

[Claims 2, 7]

Cited references 1-3

Note

An image search system, comprising:
display means that image-displays still image data, that is a search result, as a list; and
size change means changes an image size of the still image data according to a predetermined reference and displays it by the display means. This would have been easily attainable by one of ordinary skill in the art.

Section [0023] of cited reference 2 discloses that the list is displayed.

Section [0032] of cited reference 3 discloses size change.

Therefore, according to cited references 1-3, the above-mentioned structure would have been easily attainable by one of ordinary skill in the art.

[Claims 3, 5, and 8]

Cited references 1-3

Note

A image search system, comprising:
display means that image-displays still image data as a search result; and
video display means that displays an image by reproducing video data from a
reproduction time position correlated to the still image data according to a user operation input
that selects a still image to be image-displayed. This would have been easily attainable by one of
ordinary skill in the art.

Section [0058] of cited reference 1 and section [0010] of cited reference 2 disclose designation of a reproduction position.

Therefore, according to cited references 1-3, the above-mentioned structure would have been easily attainable by one of ordinary skill in the art.

If a rejection reason(s) is newly found, the applicant will be notified of the rejection reason(s).

A list of cited references, etc.

1. Japanese Published Patent Application 11-039343 (JP-A-11-039343)
2. Japanese Published Patent Application 05-282379 (JP-A-05-282379)
3. Japanese Published Patent Application 11-308567 (JP-A-11-308567)

Record of prior art reference search results

• Search field IPC 7th Edition H04N5/76-5/95

H04N9/79-9/89

- Prior art references

This record of prior art reference search results does not constitute a reason for rejection.

If you have any questions concerning this rejection or desire to have an interview concerning this application, please contact Tatsunori TAKENAKA, Examiner, Imaging Device, Patent Examination Dept. 4.

TEL. 03-3581-1101 ext. 3539

FAX. 03-3501-0715

Notice of Reasons for Rejection



Cited reference/Reference example

Docket Number FE02-01385

Transmittal Number 572027

Mailing Date November 13, 2007

NOTICE OF REASONS FOR REJECTION

Patent Application Number	2002-272523
Date of Action	November 5, 2007
Examiner	Masayuki HOSHINO 2955 5C00
Patent Agent	Hiroyuki MATSUMOTO
Applied Article	Section 29 Article 2

This application is rejected due to the following reasons. If you have any response, please submit your response within 60 days after the mailing date of this notification.

Reasons

The invention related to the following claims of this application would have been easily attainable by one of ordinary skill in the art prior to filing of the application based on the invention(s) described in the following publications in Japan or foreign countries, or publicly accessible via an electric communication line, prior to the filing of the application. Therefore, due to Patent Law Section 29 Article 2, a patent is not obtainable.

Note

Claims: 1-8

List of cited references:

1. Japanese Published Patent Application 2000-278635 (JP-A-2000-278635)
2. Japanese Published Patent Application 2000-115736 (JP-A-2000-115736)
3. Japanese Published Patent Application 2002-229438 (JP-A-2002-229438)

Note:

Cited reference 1 discloses a teaching material creation device that correlates explanation information such as a still image to each scene of an image, wherein while an image is being reproduced, a still image can be attached by clicking a still image icon at a predetermined time, and by clicking an image designation button, a still image designation dialog is displayed, and a still image can be selected (see sections [0042] and [0066]).

When the invention related to claim 1 of this application is compared to cited reference 1, both inventions have video data display means, designation means that designates a still image, and correlation means that correlates still image data to a reproduction time position. Meanwhile, claim 1 of this application is provided with image display means that displays still image data, while cited reference 1 "selects an icon of a still image file" in a still image designation dialog that is used when still image data is selected (see section [0066]). With respect to this point, this invention is different from cited reference 1.

However, in general, changing to icon display in a file designation dialog and making a selection by using a still image are performed in an image processing system that is performed by, for example, a computer (for example, Windows 2000 by Microsoft has a function in which file selection can be made by using a file name, an icon, or a thumbnail (corresponding to a still image of this application)).

Therefore, from cited reference 1, the invention related to claim 1 of this application would have been easily attainable by one of ordinary skill in the art. This also applies to claims 5 and 8.

Cited reference 2 discloses a system constituted by video data, a transmission server that transmits still image data, and a reference client as described in claims 2-3. Therefore, from

cited references 1 and 2, the invention related to claims 2-3 would have been easily attainable by one of ordinary skill in the art. This also applies to claims 6-7.

Arranging a video display portion and an image display portion displaying a still image on the same screen, as described in claim 4, would have been easily attainable by one of ordinary skill in the art, because a still image designation dialog and a video display portion are arranged on the same screen as discussed in the explanation of claim 1.

Furthermore, the invention described in cited reference 1 does not constantly display a video display of a video display portion and a still image designation dialog. However, in order to designate a still image in real time, displaying a list of still images is disclosed in cited reference 3. Please note this when the claims are amended.

If a rejection reason(s) is newly found, the applicant will be notified of the rejection reason(s).

Record of prior art reference search results

- Search field IPC H04N5/76-5/956
- Prior art references

This record of prior art reference search results does not constitute a reason for rejection.

If you have any questions concerning this rejection or desire to have an interview concerning this application, please contact Masayuki HOSHINO, Moving Image Recording Group, Imaging Device, Patent Examination Dept. 4.

TEL. 03-3581-1101 ext. 3539

FAX. 03-3501-0715